

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-65 and 72-79 are currently pending in this application. By way of this Reply claims 1, 27, 29, 55, 63, 64, 72, and 73 have been amended without prejudice. No new matter has been introduced into the application by these amendments.

The Examiner is thanked for discussing the December 6, 2005 Examiner's Amendment with the undersigned on December 19, 2005. During that conversation, the undersigned identified a few errors in the December 6, 2005 Examiner's Amendment to the claims which require correction. The Examiner agreed that such corrections should be made in a Rule 312 Amendment on the basis that the December 6, 2005 Examiner's Amendment has been entered in this application.

With respect to claims 1, 29, 63, and 72, Applicant's August 30, 2005 Reply amended the term "objective illumination region" in each of these claims to state "specific objective illumination region". The Examiner's Amendment omitted this limitation in selected portions of each of these claims. Upon discussing this with the Examiner on December 19, 2005, the Examiner agreed that this was an oversight, and that claims 1, 29, 63 and 72 should be amended accordingly.

With respect to claims 64 and 73, Applicant's August 30, 2005 Reply amended the term "light-emitting timing" in both of these claims to state "periodic successive light-emitting timing". The Examiner's Amendment omitted this

**Applicant:** Shinichi Imade  
**Application No.:** 10/689,260

limitation from both of these claims. Upon discussing this with the Examiner on December 19, 2005, the Examiner agreed that this was over an oversight, and that claims 64 and 73 should be amended accordingly. Claim 64 has also been amended to correct a typographical error in the Examiner's Amendment to correct the spelling of the word "to."

Finally, because the restriction requirement with respect to claims 27 and 55 has been withdrawn, dependent claims 27 and 55 lacked sufficient antecedent basis in view of the previous amendments made to their respective base claims. Accordingly, claims 27 and 55 have been amended to state the "specific objective illumination region" in order to recite proper antecedent basis.

Applicant submits that the foregoing amendments to claims 1, 29, 63, 64, 72, and 73 are non-substantive and have been made only to correct errors arising from the September 21, 2005 Examiner's Amendment. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing amendment to claims 27 and 55 have been made to recite proper antecedent basis and are also non-substantive in nature.

If the Examiner believes that any formal matters for this application need to be addressed, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned, by telephone, at the Examiner's convenience.

**Applicant:** Shinichi Imade  
**Application No.:** 10/689,260

Entry of the foregoing amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Shinichi Imade

By Ryan W. O'Donnell  
Ryan W. O'Donnell  
Registration No. 53,401

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-6400  
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

RWO/vs